



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,096	08/09/2001	Ghim-Sim Chua	50037.5USU1	3792
27488	7590	07/28/2005	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			LY, ANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/927,096

Applicant(s)

CHUA ET AL.

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/05/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' Communications filed on 08/09/2001.
2. Claims 1-36 are pending in this application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
5. Claims 1-3, 6, 7-10, 13-16, 18-20, 21- 22, 24-28, 29, and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,327,590 issued to

Art Unit: 2162

Chidlovskii et al. (hereinafter Chidlovskii) in view of Pub. No.: US 20020054167 A1 of Hugh.

With respect to claim 1, Chidlovskii teaches a search engine manager configured to receive a search query from a client and to communicate the standard query from the search engine manager to a search engine wrapper (see figs 1 and 2, item 80, 102 various search engines or meta-search engine (co. 4, lines 15-54 and user's search query is taken by meta-search engine search, col. 4, lines 15-54; and wrappers, which are developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and protocol accepted by the search engine, are processes for the responses to answer the search query for each search engine: col. 5, lines 8-32); and

the search engine wrapper being configured and to communicate the native format query to the registered search engine, the search engine wrapper to the search engine manager (col. 5, lines 8-42).

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63). Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly teach to translate the search query to a

Art Unit: 2162

standard, to translate the standard query to a native format query associated with a registered search engine query and being further configured to return results from the registered search engine.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455; and search result from a meta-search engine is a single list of result: section 0450).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Huge, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 2, Chidlovskii teaches a client interface configured to allow the search engine manager to communicate with the client (figs. 1 & 2, col. col. 4, lines 1-32);

a query generation module configured to receive the search query from the client interface and to generate the standard search query (col. 3, lines 1-6); and

a wrapper interface configured to provide the standard query to the search engine wrapper (col. 4, lines 45-54; also col. 1, lines 50-62).

With respect to claim 3, Chidlovskii teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components as discussed in claim 1.

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63). Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly teach a query translation module configured to translate the standard query received from the search engine manager into the native format query associate with the registered search engine.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Huge, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4,

Art Unit: 2162

lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 6, Chidlovskii teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components as discussed in claim 1.

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63). Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly teach translation of the search query for each search engine.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Hugu, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the

Art Unit: 2162

search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 7, Chidlovskii teaches at a search engine manager (col. 4, lines 22-28);

receiving a search query having a plurality of search parameters, the search query being generated by a search client (set of terms in the search query: abstract, col. 2, lines 40-64 and generating search query: col. 3, lines 1-6);

building a standard query from the search query (figs. 1 & 2, col. 4, lines 1-54) and col3, lines 1-6);

issuing the standard query to each of a plurality of search engine wrappers (col. 4, lines 41-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32); and

at each of the plurality of search engine wrappers: receiving the standard query (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 16-40).

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and



Art Unit: 2162

protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63). Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly teach translating the standard query to a native format query for a search engine associated with the search engine wrapper, and issuing the native format query to the search engine associate with the search engine wrapper.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Hugu, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 8, Chidlovskii teaches wherein each search engine wrapper is configured to issue a progress update and a wrapper ID to the search engine manager (col. 4, lines 15-54).

With respect to claim 9, Chidlovskii teaches wherein the search engine manager is configured to disable issuing the standard query to a selected search engine wrapper in accordance with the search query (col. 4, lines 41-54).

With respect to claim 10, Chidlovskii teaches wherein issuing the standard query to each of the plurality of search engine wrappers is facilitated by a standardized interface (col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32).

With respect to claim 13, Chidlovskii teaches registering a search engine to provide searching capabilities (fig. 2, multiple various search engines or meta-search engine: col. 4, lines 25-30 and lines 42-45);

receiving, at a search engine manager, a client query from a client (figs. 1 & 2, col. 4, lines 18-25);

building a standard query from the client query received from the client (col. 3, lines 1-6); and

passing the standard query from the search engine manager to a wrapper associated with the registered search engine (col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32).

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and

Art Unit: 2162

protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63). Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly teach translating, at the wrapper, the standard query to a translated query in a native format of the registered search engine and transmitting the translated query to the registered search engine; and receiving results of the translated query from the registered search engine.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455; and search result from a meta-search engine is a single list of result: section 0450).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Huge, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 14, Chidlovskii teaches wherein registering the

Art Unit: 2162

search engine further comprises registering an associated wrapper with a common registration service (col. 4, lines 41-52 and col. 8, lines 8-32).

With respect to claim 15, Chidlovskii teaches wherein registering the associated wrapper further comprises storing a wrapper ID which uniquely identifies the associated wrapper, and storing other information, in a database associated with the common registration service (col. 4, lines 15-54).

With respect to claim 16, Chidlovskii teaches wherein passing the standard query from the search engine manager is performed through a standardized interface allowing for a multiplicity of wrappers associated with other search engines to receive the standard query (col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32).

With respect to claim 18, Chidlovskii teaches wherein building the standard query further comprises combining, by a query generation module, the client query with other parameters received from the client (col. 3, lines 1-6 and col. 4, lines 1-15).

With respect to claim 19, Chidlovskii teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components as discussed in claim 13.

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63).

Art Unit: 2162

Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly teach wherein translating the standard query further comprises transforming the standard query to the native format of the search engine through the use of a translation module.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Huge, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 20, Chidlovskii teaches wherein receiving the results further comprises enumerating the results, returning the wrapper ID to the search engine manager, and returning progress updates to the manager until the results are returned (col. 4, lines 15-54).

Art Unit: 2162

With respect to claim 21, Chidlovskii teaches discovering at least one search engine registered with a search system (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 16-40);

receiving a query initiated by a client accessing the search system' (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 1-14);

building a standard query from the query initiated by the client (col. 3, lines 1-6);

requesting a response from the at least one search engine wrapper the response including a progress update for the standard query as it is executed and the results of the standard query (col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32); and

receiving the response from the at least one search engine wrapper (col. 4, lines 41-54).

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63). Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly teach transmitting the standard query to at least one search engine wrapper configured to translate the standard query to a native format query associated with the at least one search engine registered with the search system.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455; and search result from a meta-search engine is a single list of result: section 0450).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Huge, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 22, Chidlovskii teaches wherein discovering at least one search engine registered with the search system further comprises accessing a search engine store to retrieve identification information for the at least one search engine registered with the search system (col. 5, lines 8-32).

With respect to claim 24, Chidlovskii teaches wherein building the standard query further comprises using a query generation module to generate a standard query that is in the format of the at least one search engine wrapper (col. 3, lines 1-6 and col. 4, lines 1-54).

With respect to claim 25, Chidlovskii teaches wherein transmitting the standard query farther comprises not transmitting the standard query to a search engine wrapper that is excluded by the client (col. 2, lines 20-67).

With respect to claim 26, Chidlovskii teaches wherein the response received indicates that the standard query is complete (col. 4, lines 15-54).

With respect to claim 27, Chidlovskii teaches wherein the response received indicates that the standard query failed because a time limit for receiving a response is exceeded (col. 6, lines 15-26).

With respect to claim 28, Chidlovskii teaches wherein the response indicates that the standard query is because the at least one search engine associated with the at least one search engine wrapper is not finished with its associated native format query (col. 5, lines 8-32).

With respect to claim 29, Chidlovskii teaches receiving a standard query from a search engine manager (col. 4, lines 1-30);

transmitting a progress update to the search engine manager for the standard query as it is executed (col. 4, lines 1-54); and

transmitting the results received from the at least one search engine to the search engine manager (fig.2, col. 4, lines 16-40 and col. 5, lines 8-32).

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and



Art Unit: 2162

protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63). Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly teach translating the standard query into a native format query associated with at least one search engine; transmitting the native format query associated with the at least one search engine to the at least one search engine; and receiving results from the at least one search engine.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455; and search result from a meta-search engine is a single list of result: section 0450).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Huge, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 31, Chidlovskii teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions as discussed in claim 29.

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63). Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly wherein translating the standard query into a native format query further comprises using a translation module.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455; and search result from a meta-search engine is a single list of result: section 0450).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Huge, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same

Art Unit: 2162

conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 32, Chidlovskii teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions as discussed in claim 29.

Chidlovskii teaches multi various search engines and meta-search engine receiving user's search query and communicating the search query from search engines or meta-search to a wrapper, which is developed for interfacing with various search engines and take a query and present it to the search engine in a format and protocol accepted by the search engine, is process the responses to answer the search query (abstract, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 8-32; also col. 1, lines 40-63). Also Chidlovskii teaches query translation across multiple various search engines (col. 5, lines 32-42). Chidlovskii does not clearly wherein the native format query is different for each of the search engines when multiple search engines are used.

However, Hugh teaches translating search query and returning search result from search engine (translating the user's search query into a form or a native form that is understandable to the search engine: section 0455; and search result from a meta-search engine is a single list of result: section 0450).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii with the teachings of Huge, wherein the search engines or meta-search engine receiving the search query from the searcher and query translation cross a multiple, heterogeneous

Art Unit: 2162

search engines in the system provided therein (Chidlovskii's figs 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 15-54 and col. 5, lines 32-42), would incorporate the use of translating the search query into a common format to be suite to the selected search engine, in the same conventional manner as described by Hugh (sections 0455 and 0450). The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 33, Chidlovskii teaches wherein transmitting the native format query further comprises dynamically altering parameters of the native format query according to the search engine (set of terms in the search query: abstract, col. 2, lines 40-64 and generating search query: col. 3, lines 1-6).

With respect to claim 34, Chidlovskii teaches wherein transmitting a progress update further comprises transmitting an identification parameter for identifying the at least one search engine (set of terms in the search query: abstract, col. 2, lines 40-64 and generating search query: col. 3, lines 1-6).

With respect to claim 35, Chidlovskii teaches wherein the at least one search engine is stopped from continuing to execute the native format query when a time limit for receiving a response is exceeded (col. 6, lines 15-26).

With respect to claim 36, Chidlovskii teaches wherein transmitting the results received from the at least one search engine further comprises transmitting the results in response to a request for the results from the search engine manager (col. 2, lines 55-67 and col. 3, lines 1-38).

Art Unit: 2162

6. Claims 4-5, 11-12, 17, 23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,327,590 issued to Chidlovskii et al. (hereinafter Chidlovskii) in view of Pub. No.: US 20020054167 A1 of Hugh and further in view of US Patent No. 6,766,320 issued to Wang et al. (hereinafter Wang).

With respect to claim 4, Chidlovskii in view of Huge discloses a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 1.

Chidlovskii and Hugh disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chidlovskii and Hugh do not teach wherein the manager interface includes a COM (Component Object Model) interface.

However, Wang teaches a search engine may be configured according to COM (Component Object Model) interface (col. 7, lines 47-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii in view of Hugh with the teachings of Wang by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 5, Chidlovskii in view of Huge discloses a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 1.

Chidlovskii and Hugh disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chidlovskii and Hugh do not teach wherein the search engine interface includes a COM (Component Object Model) interface.

However, Wang teaches a search engine may be configured according to COM (Component Object Model) interface (col. 7, lines 47-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii in view of Hugh with the teachings of Wang by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 11, Chidlovskii in view of Huge discloses a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 7.

Chidlovskii and Hugh disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chidlovskii and Hugh do not wherein the standardized interface includes a COM (component object model) interface.

However, Wang teaches a search engine may be configured according to COM (Component Object Model) interface (col. 7, lines 47-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii in view of Hugh with the teachings of Wang by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 12, Chidlovskii teaches wherein each of the plurality of search engine wrappers are registered with the search engine manager to provide searching capabilities (col. 4, lines 15-54).

With respect to claim 17, Chidlovskii in view of Huge discloses a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 13.

Chidlovskii and Hugh disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chidlovskii and Hugh do not wherein the standardized interface includes a COM (component object model) interface.

However, Wang teaches a search engine may be configured according to COM (Component Object Model) interface (col. 7, lines 47-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii in view of Hugh with the teachings of Wang by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 23, Chidlovskii in view of Huge discloses a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 21.

Chidlovskii and Hugh disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chidlovskii and Hugh do not wherein receiving the query initiated by a client further comprises receiving the query through a COM interface..

However, Wang teaches a search engine may be configured according to COM (Component Object Model) interface (col. 7, lines 47-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii in view of Hugh with the teachings of Wang by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.

With respect to claim 30, Chidlovskii in view of Huge discloses a computer-readable medium as discussed in claim 29.

Chidlovskii and Hugh disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Chidlovskii and Hugh do not wherein receiving a standard query further comprises receiving the standard query through a COM interface.

However, Wang teaches a search engine may be configured according to COM (Component Object Model) interface (col. 7, lines 47-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chidlovskii in view of Hugh with the teachings of Wang by incorporating the use of a COM interface from the search engine. The motivation being to combine search results from each search engine of a meta-search engine into a single list of search results that satisfy the user's search query.




Art Unit: 2162


### Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to **(571) 273-4039**. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or **Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center **(571) 273-8300**

ANH LY   
JUL. 15<sup>th</sup>, 2005

  
JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER